

HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XIII, No. 1

Saturday, January 7, 1956

Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

It Happened Before: This is a year when news makes presidential candidates and around the Capital people perceive a big boost in the chances of Governor Frank Lausche, Ohio's Democratic favorite son, for a place on the party's ticket. The occasion was the CIO attempt early this week to stop a mass back-to-work movement by the usual goon violence. The CIO selected as their principal point of attack the workers of the Westinghouse plant in Columbus, Ohio, which has been struck by the CIO Electrical Workers Union for three months. Some 1700 employees of Westinghouse sought to cross picket lines and a riot ensued.

Governor Lausche issued a statement calling the conduct of the strike leaders indefensible and said he would maintain law and order if the disorders were continued. The Sheriff's deputies and the police soon after cleared the plant's gates. By his prompt reaction, the Governor quite obviously had turned the tide, for the next morning the strike officials were complaining of "goon tactics" by the local police.

The Governor went further. CIO leaders had been pressuring governors and mayors of the states where the strike-bound plants are located to make public demands upon Westinghouse for the acceptance of arbitration. Governors Leader (D., Pa.), Harriman (D., N.Y.) and McKeldin (R., Md.) had complied. Lausche — significantly and courageously — refused.

Old-timers in Washington recall that, in 1920, a governor — who had won fame by his stand in a famous strike — was swept into a vice-presidential nomination by mass demonstration on the convention floor. Calvin Coolidge, Governor of Massachusetts, hailed in 1920 as the hero of the Boston police strike of that year, was put into nomination as GOP vice-presidential nominee at the Chicago convention which had just named Harding for

first place. The "smoke-filled room" directors of the convention had already selected Senator Lenroot of Wisconsin for the second place. But enthusiasm for Coolidge was so great that the convention floor overruled the bosses and put the Massachusetts man into nomination.

In spite of attempts by "liberal" pundits to play down or minimize the Lausche boom, talk turns to the Ohio "favorite son" whenever political dopesters gather. The left-wing columnists who do not care for the conservative Governor like to limit his chances to the vice-presidential place. But old hands, perceiving a great potential mass following for the Governor, think that, as time goes on, he'll win victories and won't be satisfied with second place.

For instance, it is now rumored that Lausche intends to desert the "favorite son" role and to enter the Florida Democratic primary in May. If that be so, he would challenge two other conventional hopefuls — Stevenson and Kefauver, already entered in that state primary. The comment is that since these two are "liberal," they would divide the "pinko" vote and Lausche would take the conservative Democratic vote to win the state's delegation. At any rate, hundreds of letters and wires from Florida are streaming into Governor Lausche's office in Ohio from people urging him to break his previously announced intention not to enter any presidential primaries other than his own state.

Handicapper Reports: In the betting on the burning question — will Ike run? — it is almost a standoff this week. However, a majority of the correspondents remain doubtful that he will. No one believes that anyone in the Capital really knows the intentions of the President. It may be significant that one well-connected correspondent, known

to have a good pipeline to Milton Eisenhower, strongly doubts that Ike will run.

● One straw in the wind — deemed dangerous to the Presidential chances — is noted. The Len Hall school of thought — that “if he can walk, he can run” — has overdone it, so observers believe. In the past week, the town is discussing the current *Readers Digest* piece by William Hard, urging Ike to run again. Hard seeks to debunk the idea that the presidency is a man-killing job, to minimize effects of a coronary thrombosis and to propagate the idea that Ike will be even better fitted to fill the job. To seers in the Capital this is carrying enthusiasm too far, and some caustic witticisms have been thereby inspired. Some have started to refer to the White House as the “Old Soldiers Home,” and one wisecracker in New York, Max Lerner, suggests that a reader of the *Digest* piece “may feel tempted to dream of the Presidency for his old age as a kind of rest cure for the semi-retired.” In a more serious vein, Lerner added: “Generally a doctor’s advice afterward [after a thrombosis] is to slow up, to limit your activities, to cut out the harder phases of your work, and above all to avoid worry and tension. This seems scarcely an accurate description of the world’s most powerful — and most exacting — public office.”

● For the first time, political analysts are publicly grappling with the question — how many votes would the coronary thrombosis experience lose to the GOP, if Ike should now run? The opinion is “very many.” Raymond Moley remarks: “If Ike runs, the heart issue will lose the ticket almost as many votes as would a substitute strongly supported by a retired Ike.”

● Despite published reports to the contrary, the presidential boomlet for J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, is by no means dead. The security chief has indicated he isn’t interested, but friends who know him well are convinced that he would accept a draft. With the opinion going around Capitol Hill (where J. Edgar is very popular), there remain quite a few members who favor him. What impresses them is the bipartisan appeal which Hoover exerts in all parts of the country. “It’s something like that of Ike,” is one comment.

Additionally, they feel that J. Edgar has amply demonstrated that he knows how to work with Congress and possesses a thorough knowledge of government. Finally, of course, his patriotism and his well-known expertness on the dangers of Communism are great positive factors in his favor. The word is “watch out for a stampede for J. Edgar at the convention, if Ike does not run.”

French Election: A principal topic of discussion in Congress is the January 2 election in France. The Communist Party won the largest number of seats — 151 — compared with 98 in the old Assembly elected in 1951. The Communists won 25 per cent of the popular vote — approximately the same percentage they got in 1951.

Many members of Congress have said the last few days that the billions the United States has given to France have been wasted dollars. Recent pronouncements by French politicians indicate that the French will be as unreliable allies, in case of a war crisis, as they were in 1940. A growing number among the members of Congress are saying: “Let’s spend our money building up America and America’s defenses. Every day is proving the folly of ‘buying’ the support of France. The Communists are closer to control of France today than they were in 1947, when the Marshall Plan was authorized.”

Economic Prospects: “A recession deeper than 1949 or 1954 may hit the United States before 1956 is over,” was the message given the American Economic Association convention during the Christmas holidays by Edwin G. Nourse, one of the association’s former presidents.

While the economists attending the American Economic Association were differing — as usual — in their opinion of the future, the Nourse forecast met with an unusually large degree of acceptance.

John W. Love, the Scripps-Howard economic commentator, has been writing that the next depression will not resemble 1929 but 1920-1. It will be an inventory depression; deep, but probably short-lived.

New Probe Urged: Senator Jenner of Indiana rang the first bell for the new session of Congress by demanding appointment of a special Senate committee to investigate an organization called the National Committee for an Effective Congress. Jenner claims that this body is working for election of a left-wing Congress in 1956.

The National Committee for an Effective Congress has been in existence since 1951 but only attained headline rating in the summer of 1954, when it managed a lobbying drive on Capitol Hill to censure Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. Its first chairman was James Roosevelt, son of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, now a Representative from the 26th District of California. Judging by its financial reports, most of its money comes from two places — New York City and Los Angeles. Among the “liberal” sponsors of the body are Professor Arthur E. Schlesinger, Jr., of Harvard, prominent member of the socialistic Americans for Democratic Action; Robert Nathan, New Deal economist and prominent in the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations; Paul Hoffman, internationalist and prominent in the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic.

In 1954, Representative Clardy of Michigan denounced the NCEC as an “evil cabal of individuals engaged in an insidious effort to control Congress for motives which are highly suspect. When a Senator gets a telegram sponsored by such an organization, he ought to know that the pressure comes from individuals who are fake liberals attempting to put over socialism under the guise of liberalism.”

This is the organization which, Jenner requests, should be investigated to bring out the following points: (1) its funds and sources of such funds; (2) interlocking relations with other groups including possible Communist fronts; (3) attempts to influence the legislative program of Congress; (4) attempts to bring about the election or defeat of individual members of Congress.

Letter from ROBERT WOODS BLISS, Former Ambassador to Argentina: “I find HUMAN EVENTS most helpful in trying to appraise current affairs, both domestic and foreign, because of its fearless and fair review of public events.”

Verdict on Matusowism: Harvey Matusow, the widely-publicized “turn-about” witness before Congressional investigations, “betrayed his own country to the Communist conspiracy” when he recanted his testimony against alleged Reds, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee said last weekend in a striking report. Matusow last spring caused a somewhat synthetic sensation when he swore that he had lied for “profit” as a “professional witness” against alleged Communists in trials and investigations.

The Internal Security Subcommittee, headed by Senator Eastland, Democrat, in condemning Matusow, suggested a Federal grand jury investigation of what it called an “apparent conspiracy to obstruct justice.” Eastland said: “The Subcommittee has every reason to believe that Matusow had been telling the truth in his testimony all along until he fell into the hands of Communists last October (1954) and, for 30 pieces of silver — that is, for a little money and notoriety — betrayed his own country to the Communist conspiracy.” The Eastland group refused to believe Matusow’s statements that he was telling the truth and relieving his conscience by repudiating his earlier testimony against several hundred alleged subversives.

Matusow wrote a book, *False Witness*, early in 1955 in which he claimed he had lied extensively for money in testimony about alleged Communists. The subcommittee report said, “Stewart Alsop (member of the Alsop brothers column team) was selected by the Communist conspirators as the man to break the story of the forthcoming book. Alsop announced the publication of *False Witness* in his nationally syndicated column on January 28. He described the book as ‘inherently credible’ and added that ‘legal lying by such professional ex-Communist informers as Matusow has been tolerated by all three branches of the American government.’”

The Internal Security Subcommittee declared that publication of the book was “an audacious attempt to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery of the Department of Justice in Communist cases.”

Historical Blackout: The annual convention of the American Historical Society, held in the nation's capital during the closing days of December, 1955, not surprisingly provided a rostrum for the defenders of official propaganda history and, not unexpectedly, it granted no time to revisionist historians to answer official propaganda. As is well known, the programs of such affairs are arranged many months in advance of the meeting by the cliques which run such societies and so the end product could have been predicted. Yet, some historians were a bit shocked at the spectacle of two active participants in the making of American foreign policy defending their points of view as official speakers. These two were Herbert Feis, adviser and consultant to State and War Departments in pre-war and war years, and George Kennan, long-time State Department and Foreign Service bureaucrat and famous author of the "containment" of Communist policy. Feis attacked revisionist charges concerning the causes of the war in the Pacific, although no revisionist historians were asked to present "the other side."

"Stacked," "loaded," "rigged," were some of the adjectives applied to the affair by some dissentient historians present. It was noted that an attack was made on the McCarran Security Act — designed to take care of subversives in Government. But no attack was made on the behavior of the State Department Historical Division in its ousting of two distinguished historians whose fault was to press for full and frank publication of war-time official documents. The two were Bryton Barron and Donald Dozer — the first fired by the State Department, the latter retired.

The Barron-Dozer affair has become a *cause célèbre* in Washington. The two men ran afoul of a New Deal Democratic holdover, G. Bernard Noble, head of the Historical Division, when they pressed for early and detailed disclosure of documents and facts relative to such wartime confer-

ences as Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. After the two had been removed from the State Department, Dozer appealed to the Civil Service Commission which ordered him reinstated. At present the State Department is resisting this order and there the matter stands.

But, observers noted that the historians assembled in convention did not hear any call for the defense of two of their number so treated, and that the organization dismissed the matter by appointing a committee to look into the question of delay in publication of historical documents. But, as it is also noted, that committee will probably not report until the annual meeting a year hence.

County Chairmen: Political parties are built around the county chairmen. They are the line of communication between the state headquarters and the precinct workers. Whenever the opinion of the party's rank and file is desired, the most efficient way to get it quickly is to poll the county chairmen. The political editors of newspapers continuously telephone or wire all the county chairmen in the territory they serve. In recent weeks, grass roots polls of party sentiment have been made by *Look* Magazine, Dr. Gallup and the press associations.

If you want to play a part in the next presidential campaign, get to know your county chairman. Contribute to his campaign fund; help him to build up the enthusiasm of the precinct workers; tell him the arguments in favor of your presidential favorite; tell him how you stand on important public issues. **GET OTHERS TO DO LIKEWISE!**

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for \$1.

1955 ANNUAL BOUND VOLUME with complete Index \$15.00.

Yearly rate, \$10; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3. By first class mail, \$11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, \$12 a year; airmail, \$18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D.C. Copyright 1955.

Article Section

POLITICALLY, UNIONS AREN'T LABOR

By RUSSELL TURNER



THE REPUBLICAN PARTY would be better prepared for an effective 1956 campaign if its top brass would get together and stop confusing the words "union" and "labor."

Among bosses who decide "union" policy, the GOP will get no political support whatsoever except in relatively minor, isolated cases. Among the millions of workers who comprise "labor," it will find substantial support, particularly if it discards the union-appeasement masquerade in which its liberal wing seeks to swathe it and forthrightly proclaims its support of policies calculated to protect the rights and liberties of individual workers.

The conflict between these two approaches to a proper Republican appeal for worker votes is typified in the differing policies advocated by Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona and Secretary of Labor James Paul Mitchell.

Goldwater, as Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, openly views union bosses as the socialistic, welfare-state politicians they are; he takes his appeal over their heads directly to rank-and-file workers by citing benefits which have accrued to them under a GOP Administration.

Mitchell, put in office by the New York "liberals" who have called so many GOP signals in recent years, insists on fawning obsequiously before the union bosses in the

naive hope it will mollify their opposition to all things Republican, which, of course, it won't.

No serious observer of the American political scene harbors the slightest doubt that the multi-million-dollar slush fund which the combined AFL-CIO plans to raise next year will be used to promote Democratic candidacies. But by the same token, no serious observer doubts that millions of working men and women still will vote Republican, and that the exact number of millions will depend on the efficacy of the GOP effort to convince those workers that they are better off under Republican Free Enterprise than under Democratic socialism.

The merger of the AFL and CIO heightens, rather than lessens, the doctrinal differences between the Free Enterprise and Socialist theories of government, because the leaders of the unified organization have made so crystal clear their firm and unequivocal presence in the corner of paternalistic state socialism. Also, they make it plain that despite the denials of some, the political course on which they are embarked seeks ultimately to make the Democratic Party the American counterpart of the British Labor Party.

George Meany, President of the merged organization, derides critics of union political activities and says, "they know that we don't control votes."

"No one," he adds, "can tell the American worker how he has to vote and that includes you, me and everybody else. Our political philosophy is to inform our own people of the issues before them and in particular those that affect the welfare of our own people."

True on both counts. Neither he nor anyone else can control the votes of the 15,000,000 or so AFL-CIO members, nor can they control the votes of the some 50,000,000 American workers who belong to no union. History has shown, however, that the "informative" campaigns of the political arms of both the AFL and the CIO have been rather violent and heavy-handed at times, and there is no reason to believe this will abate under the unified set-up.

MEANY'S FRIENDS describe him as a conservative Free Enterpriser at heart; but under his stewardship, the *AFL News-Reporter*, the Federation's weekly newspaper, was as rabidly welfare-statist and socialistic as was the *CIO News* under Walter Reuther. With the merger, these two publications now have become one *AFL-CIO News* under the editorship of Henry C. Fleisher, late of the *CIO News*, and the first two issues make plain there is no easing of editorial policy. And the hundreds of publications of unions affiliated with the overall organization take their cue from papa.

Meany says GOP critics would make "second-class citizens out of union members," which is not true by the wildest stretch of the imagination. Nobody seeks to deprive individual unionists of their right to be active politically; all the Goldwater school of thought would do is to put unions on a political par with comparable organizations on the other side of the street, such as the National Association of Manufacturers or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Some members of both these units are active in

politics, some extremely so; but they do so as individuals, or through admittedly political organizations, and are fairly well divided as between Republican and Democratic advocacies. Neither the NAM nor the Chamber take any active role themselves on either side. Nor do the "house organs" published by both and by many large industrial firms.

Yet the union politickings will be financed from assessments levied in various forms against every one of the nearly 15,000,000 members of the 140 unions comprising the AFL-CIO, even though something approaching half of the membership basically dislike and oppose, in varying degrees, any form of paternalistic welfare state government.

Thus there are untold numbers of American voters compelled to contribute to a political slush fund, on pain of being thrown out of a union to which they never wanted to belong in the first place, but which they had to join to hold a job; and that slush fund then being used to "educate" the same workers to a political philosophy which they heartily detest. No right of protest, no means of appeal. Democracy, union style!

It is such circumstances and occurrences as this, that are feeding the growing revolt among rank-and-file workers, including horny-fisted wage earners, against compulsory, regimented union membership; a revolt which is fostering the growth of the right-to-work law movement, as well as the younger but budding move to curb union political activities by state statute.

Goldwater seeks to take advantage of this rebellion, Mitchell to quell it. With compelling logic, the Senator contends the right-to-work theory is part and parcel of Free Enterprise Americanism; and that with proper explanation and support, it will

spread into full-blown, rank-and-file rebellion against attempted political dictatorship by union bosses.

Mitchell, motivated by either misplaced conviction or ill-founded expediency, takes — and advocates for the GOP — the exact opposite course. He openly opposes right-to-work laws and urges their repeal; he kowtows to union bosses, pulls out all stops in praising the AFL-CIO merger, and urges it to speak out politically with a “loud and clear voice.” Strange words, from an alleged Republican; they cause one to ponder to which political party he really belongs philosophically.

Goldwater is not anti-union, but merely realistic when he calls attention to “the increasingly ruthless and successful efforts of certain elements in leadership of labor unions to take over and control the Democratic Party.” The success of these efforts already is attested by such historic events as 1944’s “clear it with Sidney;” the 1948 Democratic Convention Civil Rights victory won by the then-new Americans for Democratic Action, with CIO backing; or the 1952 union veto of Alben Barkley as the Democratic vice presidential nominee. Presently, the union political bosses have little to worry about as regards the ’56 Democratic Presidential nominee; either Stevenson, Harriman or Kefauver would be in their vest pocket.

MOST TOP Republican leaders in Congress belong to the Goldwater school of thought. Vice President Richard M. Nixon in several recent speeches has carefully gone out of his way to enumerate gains and benefits of workers since the advent of the Eisenhower Administration, including higher wages, greater stability of employment, fewer strikes and a sharp curtailment of the inflationary spiral. Senate Republican Leader William F. Knowland of

California has done likewise; so have many others.

There are, as would be expected, a few GOP left-wing dissenters, including the predictable Senator Clifford Case of New Jersey, who was rammed down the throats of that state’s Republicans by the same liberal-internationalist New York cabal which maneuvered Mitchell into the Cabinet. Case publicly condemns the Goldwater approach, and praises that of Mitchell; two of a kind.

As far as can be learned, the dispute has not been brought to Mr. Eisenhower’s attention but the development of the conflict presages the ultimate necessity of doing so. Some of his White House staff aides are getting into the picture, however, and Congressional sources report the two Administrative Assistants particularly concerned with labor problems, Gerald Morgan and Jack Martin, apparently are in Goldwater’s corner.

Some of the Senator’s supporters are known to be concerned about one particular phase of his broadside attack; they fear continued condemnation of union bosses as “goons” or “thugs” may arouse some rank-and-file resentment which would work to the disadvantage of the GOP. For this reason, the word is out that in the future a special effort will be made to confine criticism of union bosses to their political roles; to make the campaign anti-boss, not anti-union. Goldwater is said to be agreeable; he reportedly views this as a minor point, and concedes that his entire campaign pitch is a calculated risk which if not handled carefully, might conceivably cost the Republican Party votes in the overall.

The only clue as to Mr. Eisenhower’s attitude on the question was in his telephoned message to the AFL-CIO unification convention. In it, he urged unions to find means

of guaranteeing that opinions of political minorities within their structure be "accurately reflected." He made clear that he was not questioning the right of unions to voice their views on public issues, so long as those unions made provision for expression of dissenting views of members.

That, of course, is exactly what the unions do not do, and what brings on the Goldwater condemnation. It is what Harold Stassen, the President's Disarmament Assistant who usually is in the liberal camp but who on this issue surprisingly turns up among the union boss critics, has in mind in declaring that increasing union political activity "is a dangerous trend for the future well-being of the workers and of the nation as a whole." Working men and women, he says, should reach their own independent political decisions without domination or dictation from either union bosses or corporation officials.

WHAT WOULD have been one of the most ludicrous episodes of the entire debate over union policy if it had not been so dangerously demagogic and serious, was Adlai Stevenson's charge, before the merger convention, that Republican leaders are seeking to arouse the "ugly politics of group conflict and hatred."

Ludicrous, because this was only a matter of days after Stevenson's own speech in Chicago in which he accused Republicans of operating a "special interest government in Washington," declared "there is precious little evidence that the team in Washington wants to do anything about" the plight of farmers, and resurrected the charge that the GOP Administration represents only "business and industry." Those words, of course, were merely Stevensonianisms, not designed to arouse class against class or "group conflict and hatred," of course. Obviously, of the "Do as I say and not as I do" school.

For Stevenson, the union bosses have only praise; and well they should, for to a large

extent, he is their creature. They were instrumental, personally and through Americans For Democratic Action, in winning the Presidential nomination for him in Chicago three years ago; he has not changed character, nor is he the kind of politician to forget to whom he owes favors. Both the CIO and the AFL endorsed him in the general election campaign in 1952; certainly, now merged, they will do no less for him next year. Or, for that matter, they would do no less for Harriman or Kefauver, if by chance Presidential nomination lightning should strike either of them.

So, under the circumstances, it is difficult to understand what Jim Mitchell thinks the Republican Party can gain by playing footsy with the already-committed union bosses, by rebuffing the rebellious rank-and-filers who are looking for succor in their campaign to rid themselves of the yoke of union bossism.

On its face, Barry Goldwater's approach is logical and calculated to win dissident union as well as non-union labor votes; Mitchell's is not. Goldwater understands that "union" and "labor" are not synonymous in politics; Mitchell does not. If the Republican Party as a whole does not, it would be well advised to look in the nearest dictionary.

RUSSELL TURNER, a Washington, D. C., newsman for 22 years, is staff assistant to Fulton Lewis, Jr., National Radio Commentator. Mr. Turner also serves as Washington correspondent for *Partners*, Chicago monthly magazine covering the field of labor-management relations. He has previously contributed two articles to HUMAN EVENTS: "Fund for Which Republic?" on September 24, 1955, and "The Ladies Won't Knit, an Analysis of the League of Women Voters" on October 22, 1955.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: 6 for \$1; 10 for \$1.50; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10; 500 for \$20; 1,000 for \$30. In quantities of 5,000 or more, \$20 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only:
6 weeks for \$1.